DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 692 EA 024 380

AUTHOR Marshall, Catherine
TITLE The Cultural Chasm between Administrator and Teacher Cultures: A Micropolitical Puzzle. Occasional Paper No. 12.
INSTITUTION National Center for Educational Leadership, Cambridge, MA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 92
CONTRACT R117C80005
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Harvard Graduate School of Education, The National Center for Educational Leadership, 444 Gutman Library, 6 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138 ($4).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Intergroup Relations; Leadership Qualities; *Organizational Climate; *Politics of Education; Power Structure; School Administration; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Micropolitics

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that examined the teacher-administrator relationship from a micropolitical perspective are presented in this paper. Data were derived from interviews with 12 new administrators from school districts within a 50-mile radius of a major metropolitan area in the eastern United States. The micropolitical analysis identifies power distribution, values allocation, coalition building, manipulation of symbols, and conflicting ideologies and turf. Contrary to expectations of the micropolitical hypothesis, the administrators expressed no need to control teachers or to separate administration from the instructional process. Three possible explanations of the results are presented: a "new era" hypothesis; a methodological hypothesis; and a micropolitical hypothesis. From the latter perspective, the data reflect administrators' skills at managing meaning, manipulating symbols, and limiting the diffusion of awareness of the conflicts that occur in their everyday lives. The appendix contains the interview format. (Contains 53 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350692

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

The Cultural Chasm Between Administrator and Teacher Cultures: A Micropolitical Puzzle

by

Catherine Marshall
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Occasional Paper No. 12

April, 1992

EA 024 380

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

The National Center for Educational Leadership is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.,Grant No. R117C80005. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author, and not necessarily those of the funding agency.

Prepared for publication as a chapter in Blase, J., Politics of Life in Schools (1990). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Special thanks to the tweleve Peabody doctoral students who collected data and to Kathleen Ohde who assisted in data analysis.

Additional copies of this paper are available at a cost of $4.00/per copy from:

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The National Center for Education Leadership
444 Gutman Library
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Harvard Graduate School of Education
Gutman Library, 4th floor
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 496-3784

George Peabody College of Education
Box 514
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 322-8014

The University of Chicago
Department of Education
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
(312) 702-1566

NCEL OCCASIONAL PAPER AND CASE SERIES

OP#1 *Re-Thinking School Leadership: An Agenda for Research and Reform* by Lee G. Bolman, Susan Moore Johnson, Jerome T. Murphy, and Carol H. Weiss; Harvard University (February 1990), 42 pages

This paper presents a basic model of the relationship between leadership, situation, and outcomes. Personal characteristics of leaders and the situation in which leaders find themselves both influence what leaders do, which in turn influences the kinds of outcomes that they produce. Embedded in the model are three questions: "What is good school leadership?" "How does good school leadership come about?" and "What will good school leadership mean in the future?" Systematic ways of approaching these questions are also presented.

OP#2 *Preparing School Administrators for the Twenty-First Century: The Reform Agenda* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (May 1990), 47 pages

In the second wave of school reform reports and studies of the 1980s, much attention has been directed to issues of school administration and leadership. Yet, to date, no comprehensive analysis of these calls for changes in school administration has been undertaken. The purpose of this paper is to provide such a review. The goals of the paper are threefold: (1) to explain the reasons for the calls for reform of school administration, (2) to review the major studies and reports on education reform from 1982 to 1988 and (3) to discuss educational administration reform issues that need further attention.

OP#3 *What Makes a Difference? School Context, Principal Leadership, and Student Achievement* by Philip Hallinger, Leonard Bickman, and Ken Davis; Vanderbilt University (June 1990), 35 pages

This paper addresses the general question, what makes a difference in school learning? We report the results of a secondary analysis of data collected as part of the Tennessee School Improvement Incentives Project. We utilized the instructional leadership model developed by researchers at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to guide our analyses. This conceptual model makes provision for analysis of principal leadership in relation to features of the school environment, school-level organization, and student outcomes. The paper focuses on the following research questions: (1) What antecedents appear to influence principal leadership behavior? (2) What impact does principal leadership have on the organization and its outcomes? (3) To what extent is the Far West Lab's instructional leadership framework supported empirically by the data collected in this study?

OP#4 *School Restructuring: A Case Study In Teacher Empowerment* by Katherine C. Boles; Harvard University (September 1990), 58 pages

School districts around the country are in the process of initiating projects to restructure their schools. A small but growing number of these restructuring projects have been

initiated by teachers, but as yet little has been written documenting the experience of classroom practitioners involved in such efforts. The purpose of this study is to add teachers' voices to the literature on restructuring. This project restructured a portion of a school and altered the work of a group of third and fourth grade teachers.

OP#5 *Educational Reform in the 1980s: Explaining Some Surprising Success* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (September 1990), 28 pages

In this paper issues of success and failure of reform initiatives are discussed from both sides of the aisle. The paper begins with a review of the financial, political, and organizational factors which normally support the position that reform measures are likely to result in few substantive improvements. Next, the argument is made that educational reform recommendations have been surprisingly successful, and some speculations as to the reasons for this unexpected outcome are presented.

OP#6 *New Settings and Changing Norms for Principal Development* by Philip Hallinger; Vanderbilt University and Robert Wimpelberg; University of New Orleans (January 1991), 32 pages

Recently analysts have identified a variety of features that distinguish emerging administrative training programs from traditional ones. The rapid, but non-systematic growth in organizations providing administrative development services during the 1980's led to considerable natural variation in programmatic content as well as in organizational processes. In particular, significant variations emerged in the operation of state-sponsored leadership academies and local principals' centers. The purpose of this paper is to analyze variations in current approaches to educational leadership development. The paper addresses three questions: (1) What is the range of variation among emerging staff development programs for school leaders on dimensions of program content and organizational process? (2) What can we learn from the naturally occurring variations in administrative development? (3) What are the most likely and promising directions for administrative development programs in the next decade?

OP#7 *Images of Leadership* by Lee G. Bolman; Harvard University and Terrence E. Deal; Vanderbilt University (January 1991), 21 pages

This project has undertaken a major study of the "frames," or orientations, that leaders use to guide their understanding of their work. The investigators have developed a set of survey instruments to measure four leadership orientations (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), and collected data from leaders and their constituents in both education and the private sector. Their research results show that the four leadership orientations do capture significant elements of how leaders approach their task, and that those leadership variables are significantly associated with effectiveness. The results further show that the variables which predict effectiveness as a *manager* are different from those that predict effectiveness as a *leader*. In particular, structural and rational orientations are primarily predictive of manager effectiveness. This research was reported at the AERA meeting in April, 1990.

OP#8 *Trouble in Paradise: Teacher Conflicts in Shared Decision Making* by Carol H. Weiss, Joseph Cambone, and Alexander Wyeth; Harvard University (April 1991), 26 pages

Many educators advocate teacher participation in school decision-making as one strategy for improving schools. Through interviews with teachers and administrators in high schools that have adopted some version of shared decision making, the authors locate both advantages and disadvantages. Advantages center on great commitment and "ownership" of decisions. Disadvantages include, besides heavy time demands, the necessity for teachers to confront and negotiate with each other, a process that requires skills many teachers lack. There may also be conflicts with administrators, often because of unclear definitions of authority and responsibility. Suggestions are made for overcoming such problems.

OP#9 *Restructuring Schools: Fourteen Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Perspectives on Reform* by Joseph Murphy, Carolyn M. Evertson, and Mary L. Radnofsky; Vanderbilt University (May 1991), 34 pages

Few efforts have been made to inject classroom teachers' voices into discussions on restructuring. In this article, we report on one exploratory study that begins to address this oversight. We interviewed 14 teachers from diverse backgrounds about their views on the restructuring movement in general. We wanted to hear what they thought of the concept and to determine what effects they anticipated in restructuring schools. We also elicited their perceptions about what changes they would make in both the schools and classrooms if they were thrust into a school undergoing restructuring. We found that, while in some ways the views of these teachers were consistent with prevailing perspectives in the restructuring movement, in other cases, their preferences were at odds with the general body of literature on restructuring. We concluded that, while these teachers are optimistic about the possibilities of fundamental school reform, they remain skeptical about their ability to change the current educational system.

OP#10 *The Effects of the Educational Reform Movement on Departments of Educational Leadership* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (May 1991), 34 pages

This paper reviews the types of revisions that preparation programs in educational leadership have begun to make in response to three related sets of pressures brought on by the reform movement of the 1980s: pressures bearing on school administrators from the larger reform agenda, i.e., improving education across the board; general critiques of and calls for improvement in educational leadership; and specific analyses and demands for change in administrator preparation programs. The results are based on questionnaires completed by 74 chairpersons in departments of educational leadership. The emerging picture is mixed. On the one hand, departments of educational administration have begun to respond to the pressures for change. In addition, for better or worse, discernable patterns in these revisions are generally consistent with the implicit demands for improvement that lace the critical reviews of the field and with the more explicit recommendations contained in the NPBEA and NCEEA reform reports. On the other hand, the response has been moderate (at best) in intensity and mixed in focus.

OP#11 *A Typology of the Assistant Principal: A Model of Orientation to the Administrative Career* by Catherine Marshall; Vanderbilt University, Barbara Mitchell; School District of Philadelphia, and Richard Gross; Boyertown Senior High School, Pennsylvania (June 1991), 30 pages

This paper describes the working lives of twenty assistant principals, exploring the interactions between personal values and organizational contexts. School districts' individual norms and traditions present unique conditions, restraints, and possibilities for these new administrators, who respond in a variety of ways. The study identifies five distinct career orientations, linking the administrators' early socialization experiences and their eventual mobility. This typology, derived from a variety of case studies, provides a basis for structuring recruitment, training, support, and selection practices for aspirants to administrative careers. This approach can inform school districts' approaches to staff development as well as individuals' career choices.

OP#12 *The Cultural Chasm Between Administrator and Teacher Cultures: A Micropolitical Puzzle* by Catherine Marshall; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (April 1992), 29 pages

This paper examines the complex relationships between teachers and school administrators from a micropolitical perspective. Public schools have long enforced a bureaucratic separation of roles, professional status, socialization, and training, leading to value conflicts and factionalism. The move from teaching to administration can be especially traumatic, involving alienation from one peer group and gradual acceptance into another. Through analysis of interviews with new administrators, the authors explore the underlying causes of these conflicts and shifts in perspective. To what extent do teachers and administrators differ in their understandings of school culture? How do new school leaders acquire the political skills and attitudes inherent to administration, and how do these attitudes affect interactions with teachers?

OP#13 *Developing the Thinking Strategies of Instructional Leaders* by Philip Hallinger; Vanderbilt University, C.E. McCary; Durham North Carolina Schools (March 1992), 23 pages

In light of the critical role that principals play in school improvement, the inadequacy of current principal preparation presents a major problem for policy and practice. This article examines emerging research on instructional leadership and call for leadership training that emphasizes strategic thinking. The authors argue that research must address the reasoning that underlies the exercise of leadership, rather than describe discrete behaviors of effective leaders.

The article includes a description of a computer simulation designed to facilitate the transfer from research to the practice of leadership. The simulation model asks aspiring principals to choose a combination of improvement strategies using research-based cost and benefit information. The authors discuss their experiences with the simulation and offer suggestions for the design and delivery of administrative training and development.

OP#14 *Restructuring Schooling: The Equity Infrastructure* by Joseph Murphy, Vanderbilt University, (June 1992), 33 pages

This report discusses how restructuring approaches to school improvement are likely to promote further advances in educational equity. The report briefly defines restructuring

and equity, examines three ethics driving attempts to transform schools for greater equity, and reviews the restructuring literature to examine measures that offer the most hope for enhancing equity. The relevant information for this report came from literature in educational policy, school improvement, school restructuring, and school reform.

Equity issues are at the center of current initiatives to restructure schooling. These initiatives are in two areas: (1) fundamental changes in how we conceive of learning, education, and schooling and (2) specific changes in structures and learning processes in schools.

CASE STUDIES

CS#1 ***The Prince and the Principal*** will serve as a powerful discussion piece for aspiring or practicing administrators, as well as for teachers interested in leadership. In it, a new principal begins her tenure at a troubled Chicago elementary school, met with resistance and animosity from a group of "old guard" teachers. Eager to correct what she sees as glaring problems, she feels herself blocked in all efforts to effect positive change, from minor improvements to more significant school restructuring. After a series of frustrations, she makes a decisive but risky change in perspective and strategy. The case focuses on the most difficult challenge faced by new leaders: to reconcile one's emerging skills and understanding to an idiosyncratic school culture. Topics for discussion include: the importance of gaining the support of teachers, parents, and other administrators; the value of setting clear goals for improvement; and the decision to persist despite the slow pace of change.

To receive a copy of any of the above papers, send a check/money order for $4.00/per copy to: (Check payable to: HARVARD UNIVERSITY)

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The National Center for Educational Leadership
6 Appian Way/444 Gutman Library
Cambridge, MA 02138

The Cultural Chasm Between Administrator and Teacher Cultures: A Micropolitical Puzzle

by Catherine Marshall

Where there are value conflicts and conflicting needs, the analyst of site level school politics should find a great deal to study. This paper challenges the reader to solve a micropolitical puzzle, one involving the relationship between teachers and new school administrators -- an area where one would expect to find much evidence of internalized as well as external value conflicts erupting in the day-to-day enactment of roles. Yet findings from a study of new administrators movement from teaching to administration challenges the view that the culture of teachers and administrators conflict.

The Separation Between Teachers and Administrators

Insights from Previous Literature

Historical analysis. The separation between teachers and administrators was exacerbated by the creation of the elite profession of expert school managers after the municipal reform movement of the 1920's (Callahan, 1962; Katz, 1975; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Ortiz and Marshall observed:

> Over time, the structure of school organizations has become characterized by the emergence of two mutually dependent professions: teaching and administration (1988, p. 123).

From as early as 1895, there is evidence of the emergence of a business model for school management. The conflict between that model and one that focused on supporting teachers in their work came to a decision point in National Education Association (NEA) politics in the early 1900's. The business model won. Administrators dominated the NEA, and school management came to emphasize operational goals such as efficiency, cost-containment, standardization, and control (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Ortiz and Marshall, 1988). Eventually, administrators formed their own separate professional organizations. Special training and certification for administrators were developed, formalizing their separation. In addition, formal and informal job descriptions and selection processes cemented the

distinction between the work and the culture of teaching and that of school administration.

Differences in socialization and perceptions. In earlier papers , I have shown how the movement from teaching to administration can be traumatic, involving testing, separation from a strong normative reference group, and extra efforts to gain inclusion into a new group (Marshall 1979, 1985). Alienation from teachers (Alvy, 1984) and decisions about their role in the classroom (Gussner, 1974; Mascaro, 1973) are key issues facing new administrators. In recent years, the adversarial nature of collective bargaining has solidified the barriers between teachers and administrators. When principals and teachers fight from opposite sides of the table, they are even less likely to form collaborative teams working on common goals.

Teachers and administrators see the world differently, having different perceptions of the same event, issue, or program (Blase, 1987; Doan & Nolan, 1988; Roesner & Sloan, 1988; Beckner, 1985; Richardson, 1985).

Micropolitical analyses. Micropolitical analyses of teacher/administrator interactions have resulted in rich descriptions of the ways in which conflicting values, needs, and agendas are played out in the school site. For instance, Marshall and Mitchell (1990) have identified assistant principals' "assumptive worlds" -- informal rules of behavior that act as cognitive maps guiding their micropolitical behavior. Blase (in press) identifies teachers' political strategies for managing their interactions with principals. In a study of reform implementation, Noblit, Berry, and Dempsey (in press) show how the established micropolitical context affects the ways in which teachers and administrators use reforms to enhance their power. Clearly, micropolitical analysis offers a promising approach to explore teacher-administrator conflicts and competition for control.

The Need for Micropolitical Analysis

Some of the 1980's school reform efforts aim for the "empowerment" of teachers and the "restructuring" of schools to reduce the separation between service deliverers

(teachers) and site administrators. Micropolitical analysis is an important tool to measure the current state of teacher empowerment and to see if teachers' and administrators' values differences are disappearing.

This paper begins with the question, "How do new administrators experience this separateness of teacher and administrator culture?" However, the reader will be confronted with unexpected findings. Data from interviews with new administrators do not reveal evidence that administrators' and teachers' values, behaviors, and interactions are characterized by conflict!

After presentation of the assumptions, methods, and findings, the reader will be challenged to analyze the findings critically and make decisions about the best explanation. Finally, the reader will see important implications for micropolitical research, for the possibility of empowerment and restructuring, and for considering how natural restructuring might occur.

Assumptions

This section explains the logic of the paper's assumption: that there are cultural conflicts played out between teachers and administrators at the school site and that the emerging concepts and methods in micropolitical analysis are the most useful way to uncover and describe those conflicts.

Cultural Conflicts

The analysis in this paper began with the assumption that professions are cultures with values, norms, rituals, internalized informal rules, and ways of deciding who can be part of the culture. Where two or more cultures coexist and interact, day-to-day interaction will involve conflicts over values.

The culture of school administration. No comprehensive review of research on the culture of school administration exists. However, we know a great deal about the demographics and the recruitment, selection, and promotion paths in the administrative career (see Miklos, 1988 for a review). For instance, we know that white males with a bureaucratic maintenance orientation have dominated the ranks of school administration (Abbott & Caracheo, 1988; Boyan, 1988; Corwin & Borman, 1988 Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Valverde & Brown, 1988). Furthermore, a number of studies suggest that previous work experiences (e.g., years of teaching, being a counselor or a coach) and prior socialization processes affect administrators' individual orientations. In addition, important insights can be obtained from emerging cultural analyses of administration, focusing on language, values, rules, and rituals (Marshall, 1988; Gronn, 1983; Donmoyer, 1984). However, more literature exists describing teacher culture.

The culture of teachers. Starting with Willard Waller's (1932) classic, numerous studies have identified the shared background, beliefs and values, informal rules of behavior, and rewards systems of teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Lortie (1975) found common themes (e.g., teacher conservatism), while others (e.g., Metz, 1978 and Biklen, 1983) found diverse orientations among teachers. Relations

with administrators serve as an important focus in identifying the ecology within which the teacher culture exists.

In their review, Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) identify three areas-to discuss how the school context affects teachers' work lives: principal's authority, conflicts between the job and the work of teaching, and teaching as women's work. Principals' status and authority and their emphasis on the "impersonal, bureaucratic, and standardized" (p. 517) exacerbates conflicts between teachers and principals. Teachers seldom view principals as experts on classroom practice; this undermines their assertion of authority (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Biklen, 1983).

Teachers experience a variety of tensions between the organizational and personal aspects of teaching: interference of administrative duties, demands for standardization, frustration with demands for solving all societal ills, and anger about having to comply with policies made by people who are not in the classrooms (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). The perception that teaching is low status "women's work," requiring close management by (mostly male) supervisors, heightens the tensions.

Micropolitics

Because it is a new focus in the study of schooling, micropolitical concepts are still being developed and adapted from other fields. In their review, Marshall and Scribner (1991) identify the following key constructs and concepts as critical foci: distribution of power, values conflicts, social domination, diffusion of conflict,

allocation of values, decisionmaking, constituency (audience) and coalition-building, symbols manipulation, codes of conduct, ideologies connected to group affiliations, and boundaries and turf.

While scholars of the politics of education have borrowed concepts freely from political scientists, they have also noted qualities distinctive in the micropolitics of schooling. First, many micropolitical interactions are submerged, unstated, and even unnoticed. Most political acts in schools are viewed simply as part of everyday routine, what Iannaccone calls the "quiescent political process of day to day allocation of stakes [which] are largely routine consequences of decisions made by persons in their organizational roles" (1975, p. 32). These quiescent processes incorporate the outcomes of previous forgotten political conflicts. Educators often agree to keep their differences quiet, especially when public dissatisfaction emerges. They privatize the conflicts (Schattschneider, 1960), keeping them within school walls to avoid exposing their vulnerabilities.

Second, boundaries and turf wars undergo a continuous informal negotiation between administrators and teachers (Hanson, 1979). Third, policies are constantly being re-made in site level implementation as street level bureaucrats exercise their pocket vetoes and translate policies to suit the pressing needs they see and their own values systems (Iannaccone, 1975 Sproull, 1977; Weatherly & Lipskey, 1977). Fourth, the work of schooling goes on in spite of built-in, never-resolved value conflicts (Marshall, 1990). Programs, curricula, policies, and procedures are carried out even

though the actors have not agreed on whether quality, equity, efficiency, or choice should be the dominant value driving schooling.

Finally, the established roles and tasks built into the structure of schooling will, inevitably, be the basis for coalition-building. Where there are common interests and needs and specially defined common work, people will naturally develop common specialized language, rules of behavior, and shared values. In schools, that means that there are at least three sets of values in conflict -- those of students, teachers, and administrators.

Implications for Studying Teacher-Administrator Relations

To explore the assumptions described above, one must use methods that entice people to discuss their undertandings of their professional culture, and to display their awareness and behavior as they enact their roles. One would expect to find evidence of values conflicts, battles over resources and turf, attempts to dominate, to manipulate symbols and control decisionmaking, attempts to build coalitions and constituencies, and ideological conflicts.

In school micropolitics, where much conflict is submerged, quiescent, and privatized, data collection will be difficult. Educators may not be able to articulate their micropolitical behavior, given that the ongoing work of schooling requires educators to continue despite unresolved conflicts. And where they have begun to

remake policy, educators may not wish to disclose their street-level bureaucratic behavior and values.

What follows is an analysis of new administrators' reflections on their movement from teaching to administration, revealing provocative findings about their separation from teachers.

Methodology

Data Collection

We used semi-structured interviewing to collect the data. Questions were formulated with the purpose of eliciting responses about career decision-making and about the "fit" of the subjects into the administrative culture. The questions were broad in scope, yet focused enough to prompt the subjects to speak on a variety of topics such as political skills, conflicts of values, coalitions, social domination, exercise of power, boundary and turf wars, or other unanticipated micropolitical themes. (Appendix A lists the questions)

Twelve practicing administrators with skills in qualitative inquiry identified twelve subjects. All subjects were in the first three years of their administrative careers, and their positions ranged from Special Projects Coordinator to Assistant Principal and Principal. The subjects were drawn from school districts within a fifty mile radius of a major metropolitan area in the eastern United States. These districts included an inner-city with a predominantly Afro-American population as well as a wealthy suburban district populated primarily by Caucasians. The interviews took

place either in homes or school offices, were audio-taped, and lasted about thirty minutes.

Data Analysis

Using Ethnograph, a computer software program that facilitates the analysis of qualitative data, files were numbered, coded, and analyzed in a fashion comparable to the constant comparative method of Glaser and Strauss (1976). The analysis of the data was a two part process. First, interviewers assessed data quality and generated coding categories. Second, two coders identified patterns of commonality in recruitment. Continued analysis uncovered answers to questions revolving around the transition from teacher to new administrator. These questions included: How does a new school leader acquire the political skills and attitudes of the administrative culture? How does this novitiate enact values that are different and separate from those of teaching and instruction? What role models did they follow? What new or different values and behaviors were they acquiring? In attempting to find answers to these questions in the data, an unexpected anomaly surfaced. The twelve administrators talked about sharing with teachers, listening to them as colleagues, and loving teaching and instruction. Moreover, they talked as if teaching naturally leads one into administration. These surprising and puzzling findings are discussed in the next sections.

The Puzzle: Are Teachers and Administrators in Two Different Worlds?

Contrary to expectations, the fledgling administrators gave very little evidence of conflicts between themselves and teachers. As they spoke about their recruitment and entry into administration, they identified a few areas where separation from teachers was noticeable. The preponderance of data, however, supported a conclusion that administrators love teaching and instruction; that they actively work to be sharing, listening, and collegial in their relationships with teachers; and, that administrative careers seem to evolve naturally from teaching.[1] The following sections present evidence of a separation, the evolution from teaching to administration, and the continuing ties.

The Separation

There were a few instances where the administrators gave indications of a sense of separateness from teaching. One assistant principal had been an administrator in another district. When he was threatened with a classroom assignment after the superintendent was fired, he said:

> I did not want to teach in that county where I had been an administrator so I came to this district, as a teacher, for five years before getting back into administration.

His explanation was that once one has left teaching ranks, it is traumatic to return, but that switching districts eases the way.

In another instance, a Special Projects Teacher (central office staff) said:

> There was never an episode or confrontation that has occurred that would make me feel remorse for taking my position. At this point I will not go back to teaching.

No others took this firm stand and, in fact, one (see below) spoke of the ease of going back to teaching.

In two instances, the task of evaluating teachers was described in ways that implied some sense of separation for administrators, as expressed in this quote:

> In this building I'm building relationships with people so that I can talk with them about issues such as teacher performance evaluation. I think that it takes a little time to build relationships and certainly you talk about things, it takes a lot to build a friendship as well as a professional friendship.

In addition, one administrator indicated that teachers stopped talking openly once he became an administrator:

> [Question: Were there examples of times when you were seen as a non-member after you were appointed as an administrator?] It actually got to a point where you could walk into a room and every one would stop talking.

In approximately six hours of interviews focusing on recruitment into administration, very little evidence indicates that these fledgling administrators noticed a great chasm between themselves and their teacher colleagues. Instead, we found far more data suggesting that teaching and administration were not so widely separate, not such different worlds with different values.

An Easy Evolution from Teaching to Administration

Contrary to expectation, the administrators spoke of their entry into administration as a flowing process, without abrupt exits or entrances between cultures.

A natural evolution. Andrews, in discussing her move into administration, spoke as if it naturally evolved. Free of separation traumas:

> I have to say, the entire time I was in the classroom . . . administration was not something that I desired to do. But after someone asked me if I would be interested in taking a position at the area office . . . I told them that I would.

However, she did acknowledge that having majored in administration in her masters program led to her being asked. However, she said, "I figured if I liked it I would try it and stay with it; if not I knew that I could go back to my classroom."

Woods expressed the same sense of naturalness to his transition from teaching to administration:

> I was always the kind of person who wasn't talking just about my classroom. . . . Then I suppose I became an informal leader or at least somebody that knew what other teachers were thinking. So that when committees were put together or when a principal needed somebody or something done, I was involved.

Woods also described his sense of ease with central office staff and with principals coming into his classroom, suggesting that he had, in turn, become a principal who expected teachers to be comfortable with visits from parents and administrators.

Parton's description also portrays a sense of natural evolution from teaching to administration:

> I taught for about nine years and I enjoyed teaching. I always wanted challenge and therefore I went back to school and received a masters in administration and pursued the administrative career. I love children; I enjoyed working with them and I thought I could be better used by having influence over more children.

<u>New skills, perspectives, and responsibilities</u>. While giving little evidence of abrupt separation from teaching, these new administrators did speak of old and new skills and responsibilities. Listening and patience, especially, were skills to accentuate and expand in the principalship. Andrews explained:

> Take them as individuals, knowing that there may be some strategy pose, or posture you can take with one that will help you with another. And with parents, students, teachers, the first thing you have to do is throw away everything, be quiet, be patient, and listen . . . . You do not have to make your decision right then . . . . Everyone that comes through that door has baggage; you have to find out what that baggage

> is and be able to relieve them of it before you can deal with the problem.

Interestingly, Andrews then went on to explain that she had developed her listening skills in the classroom:

> A lot I do stems from experiences with the classroom . . . . I was a very demanding teacher; I knew that the only way that I could get to that child was to be able to listen and work with each individual in the class, which required a lot of listening.

She continued, explaining that during her time in a staff position, she "spent a lot of time in marketing ideas or behaviors that you want people to adapt or to adopt." Other administrators used almost the same words in discussing listening skills.

Management and politics. Ample evidence in the data demonstrates that the fledgling administrators felt that entering administration meant widening one's world view. They talked about seeing a "bigger picture." Some statements encompass role expansion for management, control, public relations, and politics. Andrews acknowledged the need to take a stand:

> At certain times there was no way to manipulate, get around, or avoid. Then I had to take a stand. That is the other side of trying to move people to a point. I think that coming together as well as having an understanding of the total system in order to help in the problem solving that goes on from day to day. Those are critical areas that I think are important for principals.

In response to a question, Andrews objected to the use of the phrase "managing politics," saying:

> I prefer to say, how do I do the things I knew were necessary to move to this point; I looked to see what the county policy was, what the requirements would be and what little check points all others had gone through and I did the same.

Woods spoke of "politics" as he spoke of widened perspectives:

> The administrator role is slightly different [from teacher] but I think the philosophy that guides you stays the same . . . . I'm a child advocate and that doesn't change. As a teacher I was a child advocate, same as now.

> From that perspective then you deal with all the other in a way that keeps you sane, keeps your job but all the other things that politics come into it and you have to be aware of your constituents that means to understand them, know where they are coming from, and, I think, keep them informed.

While these administrators shied away from talking explicitly about politics, they displayed common values in their language. One frequently-used phrase was "be a people person". Parton, for example said:

> You need to like people, enjoy working with them and be sensitive to their particular needs . . . also believe in the self worth of every individual.

She went on to explain that this perspective allowed her to use all the available resources and enabled her to enact her "vision".

Sutton, describing the expanded skills required to bring in "a new kind of population" to start a non-traditional (open) school when "parents and others were unsure about the acceptability of the new school or this new idea," Spoke of the need to:

> communicate to all parties: parents, students, teachers because you have to take care of the challenges as well as promote the ideas of what the education process is about and what you're doing.

She said this expands "the public relations role."

McPherson emphasized the need to develop a public image of concern mixed with diplomacy:

> You must show that you deal with problems and situations in the manner that you try to resolve the problems diplomatically, but in a way that you think is correct.

Describing what he learned from role models, Woods said:

> You pick up management techniques and ways of dealing with people in certain situations. You learn how principals can really impact on the instruction program because you see principals actually doing it. That struck me as something that I wanted to do, I wanted to be a principal who could help the teachers. Principals that I have been under did that and I wanted to be visible.

While expressing a value of instruction, Woods revealed a political skill for being visible, displaying values, and staying tuned to constituents. As he put it, "there are constituents out there...parents, principal, central office...kids."

Thus, the new skills and perspectives these administrators learned included sensitivity to public relations, working with a constituency, creating an image and/or vision, and learning that image-maintenance is part of the work.

The Continuing Ties With Teaching

The preponderance of evidence from the interviews revealed administrators who valued teachers, valued the instructional process, and valued staying tuned into curriculum, instruction, and kids. These fledgling administrators appear to share values and goals with teachers.

Love of teaching. Most of the administrators expressed a love of teaching and many expressed hesitation about leaving the classroom. Stone's statement reflects the views of others when she said: "when I was applying for administrative jobs I was going back and forth--do I really want to leave the classroom?"

Teachers as colleagues. In various ways, the administrators displayed an attitude toward teachers that was collegial and respectful. For example, in speaking of his role model, Woods said:

> He was very visible and he was in the classroom a lot because he wanted to be with the kids the same way I did and that was a nice, different way of thinking about being a principal. Up to then I really thought of a principal as a manager of a building rather than an instructional kind of resource as well. That changed my mind . . . . It was something small; it was just once, twice a day, once or twice a week but it was constant, not just when you needed him or when he was there to formally evaluate you.

Valuing professionals. The data contained some strong values statements in which administrators asserted the need to value people generally, and teachers particularly. For instance, Parton said:

> I think you need to believe in the self worth of each and every individual, and with that I think that you will be able to use the various

> resources in your building to meet the needs of those children. So, first be a people person and then secondly, I would say, have a vision of where you want to go and I guess you should say to have a philosophy of life really, and of education of course; That should be the guiding force to the decisions you will make at the school.

Stone expressed a similar view:

> One, you have to value the people you work with and know that they are all professionals, that you are not everything, that they all have their pieces to share and that you should not be there making the decisions, all the decisions, that is a group effort. You have to learn to listen, to make them feel comfortable to talk with you and also when there is an issue that you have to be firm on if you have made a decision after everything is said and done and to hold firm.

Summary of Findings

Interviews with twelve new administrators revealed no discussion of the need to keep teachers in control or to keep administration separate from the instructional process. Instead, the findings describe administrators who love teachers, see little separation between themselves and teachers, and see their role as extending from teaching.

Searching For an Explanation

Where are the pitched battles, the values conflicts, the turf wars, the clashes over different goals, and the adversarial disputes as one coalition protects its perogatives against another's? What's wrong with this picture? Perhaps the separation between the cultures of teacher and administrator is not as great as described in previous research. Was previous research wrong? Have the cultures changed? Three different hypotheses can be proposed to explain these unexpected and puzzling findings. This section presents these explanations, inviting the reader to accept, reject, or offer alternative hypotheses.

The "New Era" Hypothesis

Perhaps we have already accepted restructuring in entirety, without a struggle or resistance. Many of the reforms proposed in the 1980's sought to create school-site management, empowering teachers to have ownership of programs, policies, and curricula, and to be true participants in school site decisionmaking. Perhaps it has simply happened. Perhaps the old mindsets that separated teachers and administrators (reflected in previous literature, in union activity and in micropolitical battles) have disappeared. One way to explain the data showing close connection between the teacher and administrator cultures is to accept the hypothesis that we are in a new era in school politics.

Within this "new era" hypothesis, we should look for evidence of cooperation, shared values, fluid movement back and forth between teaching and site administrative positions, and equalization of salary and status differentials between teachers and administrators. We should also see movement toward a merging of teacher and administrator recruitment, training, selection, and promotion processes.

Evidence from previous research. There are some indications from previous research to support the possibility that the chasm has been exaggerated. A study of work values of teachers and administrators revealed few differences between administrators and non-administrators (Kelly, 1975; Kelly & Metzcus, 1975). Several scholars (Bush & Kogan, 1982; Cuban, 1976) have suggested that administrators' experiences shape their values as they move up the administrative ladder, but they never lose all of the common values shared with teachers.

Evidence from current trends. Increasingly, professors of educational administration and state training academies are proposing that their curricula include an emphasis on supervision of instruction or instructional leadership in their programs (University Council for Educational Administration, UCEA, 1987). There is also an increasing realization that teachers already are managers and that classroom management and curriculum planning are administrative and policymaking skills teachers already possess and use. The decade's-worth of research on change in school and on policy implementation would lead to predictions that restructuring

would, at the very least, take a long time and perhaps even be so successfully resisted that it became null and void. Nevertheless, it is possible that the research reported above captures surprising, unpredicted evidence that we have already entered a new era in teacher-administrator relations.

The Methodological Hypothesis

Narrow, incomplete methods may explain the lack of evidence of a chasm between teachers and administrators. The assumptions, the sampling, the actual data collection, the research instrument, or other methodological flaws may have resulted in fluke findings.

Wrong assumptions. In designing the research, it was assumed that asking about recruitment into administration would yield administrators' sense of the process of separating from teacher ranks and entering a new and different professional culture. We feared that direct questions would constrain the range of subjects' words and discussion. In their discussion of entry into administrative culture, it was assumed they would reveal intimate knowledge of politics. This did not happen.

Wrong subjects. The research assumed that new administrators would be closest to the recent separation from teachers, most aware, and perhaps still experiencing moral dilemmas and traumas as they aligned themselves with a new and separate culture. While this assumption was based on long-established theories about rites of passage and on a large body of literature on professional cultures (Glazer, 1968), the assumption may have been inappropriately applied. Perhaps these entry level site administrators had not yet encountered or confronted micropolitical conflicts at the interface of teacher and administrator zones.

Wrong choices of data collection instruments. It was assumed that, by having practicing administrators select subjects, interviews would be open, collegial, and friendly. Perhaps this backfired. The fact that many subjects worked in the same districts with their interviewers may have made subjects careful about revealing delicate truths. These subjects may have been competing for the same administrative career positions, they may have been from different, conflicting coalitions in micro

and macropolitical skirmishes in their areas. Unfettered truths and revealing phraseology will not emerge in such circumstances.

Talk is not enough. It is quite possible that interviewing elicits only the carefully chosen rhetoric that practiced administrators skillfully produce. Perhaps these administrators responded to the interview/data collection with the same response set used in thirty minute meetings with reporters, parents, union representatives. Such a response set calls for carefully contrived phases with tight control over the values displayed. Perhaps these administrators are simply very good at articulating the values that they know to be the public values, and hiding any values and values-conflicts that would be evidence of micropolitical infighting.

Gronn (1983) and Marshall (1988) advocate a focus on talk to understand the culture of administration. To get a true picture of administrators' talk, one must observe interactions in the natural setting. Interviews may not suffice. Would this research have uncovered a chasm (values conflict, competition for control, stories of teacher pitted against administrators, stories of site administrators' traumas over issues like teacher evaluation, separation from teachers) if the subjects were observed over several days doing their work? Would incidents and interaction have revealed micropolitical tensions which, then, could be grist for more finely tuned and honest interviews?

Since conflicts are privatized in school micropolitics, interviews alone may elicit only socially legitimized values. Where the work of administrators includes projecting the legitimized social construction of reality, "certain questions are unaskable, and certain events remain unobservable" (Anderson, 1990, p.42).

Self-perception or self-deception. Finally, the interview data may be a very true reflection of a phenomenon of falsification. These fledgling administrators may be caught up in the trauma of separation from teacher, of being seen as "the enemy" by teachers who are friends, and of learning to fit into the tasks and values of the administrative culture. Facing that and bringing to consciousness those traumas in a brief interview is too painful. Perhaps they get through these traumas by daily self-deception. Or, caught up in the rush of promotion and the desire to fit in with others

in the higher ranks, they are working hard to deny the daily micropolitical realities. Or?

The Micropolitical Hypothesis

In micropolitical analyses of schools, one identifies power distribution, values allocation, coalition building, audience and constituency-building, manipulation of symbols, conflicting ideologies, and fights over turf. These data show no such patterns. Or do they? Perhaps the data are evidence that actually verify micropolitical phenomena.

Symbols-management. Suppose these interviews, instead of capturing frank and open talk, elicited the talk of administrators at work, projecting the socially desirable symbols of the 1990's? Perhaps the culture of school administration requires new administrators to project rhetoric that lends meaning and support to values of camaraderie with teachers and of desiring close connection with instruction and wide input into decisionmaking. If so, these fledgling administrators performed well. They eschewed discussion of politics: none expressed frustration with or clear separateness from teachers.

Educators, faced with the need to get on with the work of schooling, and with no luxury of time to pull back and assess purposes, may agree to shove conflicts and dilemmas aside. Perhaps that is part of the work of administrators--to lead workers to acceptance of an agreement to put aside differences and conflicts and rally to common goals. If so, these administrators were demonstrating the kinds of phraseology and symbols that, if believed, would inspire teachers to keep on cooperating.

When organizations are nothing but collective agreements, administrators' critical tasks include orchestrating people's continuing belief in and commitment to those agreements (Smircich, 1983; Anderson, 1990). As illustrated in Wolcott's The Man in the Principal's Office (1973), meetings and talk create organizational realities and meanings.

Thus, the data may reflect administrators' skill at managing meaning, manipulating symbols, and limiting the diffusion of awareness of the conflicts and dilemmas that rage in their day- to-day realities.

Summary and Implications

Whichever hypothesis is chosen, this paper should provoke discussion. It generates hypotheses, raises questions, and challenges the practitioner and the scholar to engage in sense-making. Theory and concepts are borrowed (Marshall and Scribner, 1990), so much work is needed to identify which of these borrowings will actually fit. Researchers and practitioners alike can see that surface meanings (e.g., staged interviews) may not provide an accurate picture of real values and real conflicts. However, if one wishes to identify and describe the image-projection of practicing administrator-politicians, analysis of speech will be very valuable.

Reformers who attempt to "professionalize" teaching, empower teachers, restructure schools, or make principals "instructional leaders" must confront the micropolitics of schools. Strongly entrenched values, norms for interactions, and inviolable coalitions may blunt or kill reform efforts, regardless of the offered incentives for alterating the bureaucratic structure. Altering culture is not a simple venture to be done mechanistically. We must first identify the extant culture and discover its etiology and the critical functions served. No reform, no matter how well-intentioned, will succeed if it tears down the traditions and the sacred values of an existing and functioning culture.

Finally, practitioners who recognize the power of micropolitical analysis must face ethical choices. Some will recognize themselves using rhetoric, espousing politically tailored values and covering over (privatizing) conflict. Practitioners must choose whether this politically astute management is functional in the long run. Or they must decide to make their behaviors match their rhetoric, and to allow themselves to be held accountable for results promised. Can the administrator who "loves teaching" demonstrate how his/her behaviors toward teachers and the

curriculum are enactments of this value? Such authentication of espoused values will be necessary before teachers and administrators can share common values and goals. And if they choose to use their political skills, which values will they pursue? How will they enact efficiency values, equity values, choice values, and quality values all at once?

APPENDIX A

Questions About Career Socialization

1. How long have you been an assistant principal/principal?
2. Tell me about some of the factors that helped you decide to be an administrator.
    a. Who were your supports?
    b. What obstacles did you encounter?
    c. How were you recruited and hired?
3. Tell me about how you were hired? Were there any indications of why you were chosen rather that someone else?
    a. Were there any particular district policies that favored your being hired?
4. Did other administrators give you ideas about how to be an administrator?
    a. Did you have a mentor?
    b. Did you have any role models?
    c. How did you manage the "politics" of recruitment and hiring?
5. What sorts of things did you do to get visibility and attention to ease your way into administration?
6. Were there any tasks or functions that taught you a lot about administration?
7. What were some things you learned that you must do to be a school leader? How did you learn these things?
8. Tell me about how you learned the best way of talking, dealing with parents, central office, students and teachers? How did you learn this?

Footnote

[1]The Ethnograph program stores data and, when coded data are pulled out, the program displays the ways in which categories overlap each other, and it counts the number of times categories appear in each and in all data sets.

References

Abbott, M. G., & Caracheo, F. (1988). Power, authority, and bureaucracy. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. (pp. 239-257). New York: Longman.

Alvy, H. B. (1984). The problems of new principals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1979A.

Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(1), 38-59.

Beckner, W. (1985). Needs in smaller schools of the United States. Research in Rural Education, 2(4), 141-145.

Biklin, S. K. (1983). Teaching as an occupation for women: A case study of an elementary school. Syracuse, NY: Education Designs Group.

Blase, J. J. (1987). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. American Educational Research Journal, 24(4), 589-610.

Blase, J. J. (1989). The micropolitics of the school: The everyday political orientation of teachers toward open school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(4), 377-407.

Blase, J. J. (in press). Education and Urban Society.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boyan, N. J. (1988). Describing and explaining administrator behavior. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 77-97). New York: Longman.

Bush, T., & Kogan, M. (1982). Directors of education. London: George Allen & Univin.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Corwin, R. G., & Borman, K. M. (1988). School as workplace: Structural constraints on administration. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. (pp. 209-237). New York: Longman.

Cuban, L. (1976). Urban school chiefs under fire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doan, M. F., & Noland, R. G. (1988). Leadership perceptions of the elementary school reading program. Reading Horizons, 29(1), 13-21.

Donmoyer, R. (1984 April). Cognitive anthropology and research on effective principals: Findings from a study and reflections on its methods. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, New Orleans, April, 1984.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. (pp. 505-526). New York: MacMillan.

Glaser, B. (Ed.). (1968). Organizational careers: A sourcebook for theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Gronn, P. (1983). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 1-21.

Gussner, W. P. (1974). The socialization of a school administrator (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 2081A.

Hanson, E. M. (1979). Educational administration and organizational behavior. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Iannaccone, L. (1975) Education policy systems: A study guide for educational administrators. Florida: The National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders Nova University, Fort Lauderdale.

Johnson, S. M. (1988). Unionism and collective bargaining in the public schools. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, (pp. 603-622). New York: Longman.

Katz, M. B. (1975). Class, bureaucracy and schools. New York: Praeger.

Kelly, T. W. (1975). Occupational socialization and the work value orientation of public and parochial school administrators on the elementary and secondary school levels (Doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 1213A.

Kelly, T. W., & Metzcus, R. H. (1975). Occupational socialization and work values of parochial and public school administrators: A comparative analysis. Notre Dame Journal of Education, 6, 36-42.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Macmillan.

Marshall, C. (1979). Career socialization of women in school administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Marshall, C. (1985). Professional shock: The enculturation of the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 28-58.

Marshall, C. (1988). Analyzing the culture of school leadership. Education and Urban Society, 20(2), 262-275.

Marshall, C. (1990). Educational policy dilemmas: Can we have control and quality and choice and democracy and equity? In Borman, Swami, and Wagstaff (Eds,) Contemporary Issues in U. S. Education. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1990, April). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. Paper presented at the annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Marshall, C., and Scribner, J. (1991). "It's all political!": Inquiry into the micropolitics of education. Education and Urban Society, 23(2), 347-354.

Mascaro, F. C. (1973). The early on the job socialization of first-year elementary school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.

Metz, M. H. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Miklos, E. (1988). Administrator selection, career patterns, succession, and socialization. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 53-76). New York: Longman.

Noblit, G. W., Berry, B. W., & Dempsey, V. (in press). The politics of professionalism. Education in Urban Society.

Ortiz, F. I., and Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In Norman J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 123-142). New York: Longman.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Richardson, M. S. (1985). Perceptions of principals and teachers on effective management of student behavior. Spectrum, 3(3), 25-20.

Roesner, C. A., & Sloan, C. A. (1987). Principals' leadership behavior--Do you see yourself as your subordinates see you? NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 68-71.

Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). The semi-sovereign people: A realists view of democracy in America. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of Cultural and Organization Analysis. Administration Science Quartely, 28, 339-358.

Spindler, G. D. (1982). Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Sproull, L. (1977). Managerial attention in new educational programs: A micro-behavioral study of program implementation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America. New York: Basic Books.

University Council for Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's Schools: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Tempe, AZ: Author.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Russell & Russell.

Weatherley, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform. Harvard Educational Review, 47(2), 171-97.

Valverde, L., & Brown, F. (1988). Influences on leadership development among racial and ethnic minorities. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), The Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 143-151). New York: Longman.